

**REMARKS**

This Amendment and Response is filed in reply to the Office Action dated July 3, 2003. In this Response, Applicants amend independent claims 1, 8, and 13 to traverse the Examiner's rejections. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the originally filed disclosure. Amendments to the claims are not an acquiescence to any of the rejections. Furthermore, silence with regard to any of the Examiner's rejections is not an acquiescence to such rejections. Specifically, silence with regard to Examiner's rejection of a dependent claim, when such claim depends from an independent claim that Applicants consider allowable for reasons provided herein, is not an acquiescence to such rejection of the dependent claim(s), but rather a recognition by Applicants that such previously lodged rejection is moot based on Applicants' remarks and/or amendments relative to the independent claim (that Applicants consider allowable) from which the dependent claim(s) depends. Furthermore, amendments to the claims are being made solely to expedite prosecution of the instant application. Applicants reserve the option to further prosecute the same or similar claims in the instant or a subsequent application. Upon entry of the Amendment, claims 1-17 are pending in the present application.

The issues of the July 3, 2003 Office Action are presented below with reference to the Office Action.

With regard to the Office Action Summary: The Examiner noted that the Office action dated July 3, 2003 was responsive to communication(s) filed on January 21, 2003. Applicants have no record of a January 21, 2003 communication to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. If the Examiner finds that the citation was not in error, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned to identify such communication.

With regard to the Office Action, paragraph 1: The specification was objected to for using trademark names that were not fully capitalized. Applicants amend the specification as suggested by the Examiner and thus traverse the objection to the specification.

The drawings were objected to by the Examiner for containing informalities. Applicants submit herewith eight sheets of corrected drawings containing Figures 1-6 in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §1.84.

With regard to the Office Action, paragraphs 2-4:

- (1) Claims 1, 2, and 7-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Davis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,367,009);
- (2) Claims 4-6, 16, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al. in view of Ginzboorg et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,240,091);
- (3) Claims 3 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al. in view of Grimmer (U.S. Patent No. 5,774,552).

With respect to (1) above, Applicants' independent claim 1, directed to an access system for a computer site, is amended to more clearly recite the claimed features to include, among other things, "an access control system, coupled to the directory, for controlling access to a computer site by permitting the user to access a portion of the computer site and restricting the user from accessing at least one other portion of the computer site, based on the access policy associated with the user in the directory." Support for the amendment can be found in the application in page 6, line 21 - page 7, line 6 and in page 10, lines 5-14.

Davis et al. do not teach the feature of independent claim 1 directed to controlling access to a computer site by permitting the user to access a portion of the computer site and restricting the user from accessing at least one other portion of the computer site, based on the access policy associated with the user. Rather, Davis et al. teach access control in which access to a server (end-tier server) is either entirely granted or denied based on comparing a user name to a list of authorized users. If a user name is on the list, requests submitted to the server using the user name will be processed, and if the user name is not on the list, requests submitted to the server using the user name will be rejected (Davis et al., col. 13, lines 27-42). Davis et al. teach only that a user can be either denied or granted access to the server, which is not the same as permitting the user to *access a portion* of a computer site and restricting the user from accessing *at least one other portion* of the computer site, as claimed in Applicants' independent claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants traverse the Examiner's rejection of independent claim 1 based on 35 U.S.C. §102(e), and consider independent claim 1, as amended, to be allowable. Similar to independent claim 1, independent claims 8 and 13, as amended, also recite "controlling access to the computer site by permitting the user to access *a portion* of the computer site and restricting the user from accessing *at least one other portion* of the computer site." Accordingly,

Applicants also consider independent claims 8 and 13 to be allowable. Claims 2-7 depend from allowable independent claim 1, claims 9-12 depend upon allowable independent claim 8, and claims 14-17 depend upon independent claim 13, and thus such dependent claims 2-7, 9-12, and 14-17 are also allowable for depending upon allowable base claims.

### Conclusion

Applicants consider the Response herein to be fully responsive to the referenced Office Action. Based on the above Remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, allowance is requested. If there are any remaining issues or the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation with Applicants' attorney would be helpful in expediting the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (781) 466-2220.

Respectfully submitted,



James Weixel  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 44,399  
Customer # 32127

Verizon Corporate Services Group Inc.  
c/o Christian Andersen  
600 Hidden Ridge, HQE03H01  
Irving, TX 75038  
Tel.: (781) 466-2220  
Fax: (781) 466-4021